

Of course, the funding level requested for technology is only part of the problem. The question isn't just how much do you want to spend but what do you need to spend it on?

As I mentioned, this is one pot of funding that would support two purposes: security at the border and security between the ports of entry. Both of those functions are essential to our security and our economy, but the White House didn't delineate how it would split that funding. Would it be divided 50-50? Would it be distributed based on need? How would the administration ensure that it was closing the highest priority security gaps first?

We have a responsibility to taxpayers to ensure that every dollar is maximized and serves the greatest purpose possible. A few years ago, Senator SINEMA, the Senator from Arizona, and I introduced something called the Southwest Border Security Technology Improvement Act to help understand the best way to do that.

It required the administration to assess technology needs at the border and issue a report within a year. Our bill was signed into law at the end of 2020, and the deadline for that final report was December 27, 2021. Well, 15 months has passed, and we still have no report. I have repeatedly asked for updates from the administration but received zero response.

In short, the administration has failed to provide an assessment that is necessary for Congress to determine what the technology gaps are at the border and what the priority should be. Instead, they just ask Congress for a \$535 million blank check. They have offered zero assurance that they plan to use those funds to increase operational control over the border. They haven't even assured us they know what those needs are. Once again, the administration isn't trying to solve the problem—just to create an illusion of effort.

But technology funding isn't the only problem with the President's budget; it also falls short when it comes to personnel.

I have been to the southern border more times than I can count—but I do count 10 times—since President Biden took office, and I have spoken with every law enforcement officer and local elected official, nonprofit, and small business owner I could find. When I ask them what is needed the most to combat this crisis, there is a recurring answer: We need more boots on the ground. We desperately need more Border Patrol agents on the frontline.

The administration wants to hire an additional 350 Border Patrol agents, which would be a great start, but the White House isn't taking any action to address underlying barriers to hiring those agents.

For years, the Agency struggled to meet its staffing goals, and one of the biggest obstacles is the polygraph requirement. Roughly half of new applicants fail the polygraph, which one officer described as “high-tech voodoo.”

Applicants have shared stories of aggressive and condescending examiners. They talk about being stereotyped based on their background and traveling to other States in hopes of having a different experience.

Still, failing a polygraph or receiving an “inconclusive” result disqualifies a potential agent. So it wouldn't matter if the White House called for 10,000 new Border Patrol agents in its budget; the Agency would not be able to fill those spots until the administration fixes the broken application process, and we have seen no indication of their plans to do so.

The White House is also calling for 460 processing assistants at Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. These would be the men and women who would help process the migrants. Based on my conversations with folks at the border, I can tell you these additions are desperately needed, but that is only one piece of the solution.

A huge part of the solution lies in deterrence. If people with frivolous asylum claims see they will quickly be removed from the United States, they aren't likely to attempt the journey to our border in the first place. That is why we just can't staff up on processing coordinators; we need more personnel to actually enforce the law and deliver consequences to those who break it.

The Biden administration has refused to do so time and time again, and the Biden budget only makes insignificant changes to staffing for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Removal Operations, as well as Fugitive Operations team members. These are the dedicated men and women who do the difficult but important job of removing people who have no legal right to enter the country. But right now, the system is so overwhelmed with migrants who will not be ultimately granted asylum. So what happens when their claim is denied? It is an important question to ask because I can assure you, ICE does not have the sufficient manpower to enforce the law given the scale of this crisis.

In short, the White House has proposed adding more personnel to process migrants and then release them, but it doesn't want to hire more people who will actually remove people who break our laws. Based on his own assessment strategy, President Biden does not value border security because his budget certainly does not reflect it. His budget is not a serious proposal to gain operational control of the border. It is more talk with no action.

Our country is experiencing an absolutely unprecedented migration crisis. The southern border has become an open highway instead of a secured checkpoint. The administration is essentially waving everyone through—from migrants with frivolous asylum claims to the drug runners who are carrying fentanyl that kills our fellow Americans. Based on President Biden's

budget, he appears content for it to stay that way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Massachusetts.

SILICON VALLEY BANK AND SIGNATURE BANK

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on Friday, we experienced the second largest bank failure in our Nation's history. And make no mistake, this failure was the direct result of leaders in Washington weakening financial rules.

In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act to protect consumers and to ensure that big banks could never again take down the economy and destroy millions of lives.

Since then, Wall Street executives who hated the whole idea of the bill spent millions to keep it from becoming law and, after it passed, spent millions more to try to weaken it.

In 2018, the big banks won. With support from both parties, President Trump signed into law a law to roll back critical parts of Dodd-Frank. Now, I fought against these changes. On the eve of the Senate vote in 2018, I warned from right here on the Senate floor that “Washington is about to make it easier for the banks to run up risk, make it easier to put our constituents at risk, make it easier to put American families in danger, just so that the C.E.O.s of these banks can get a new corporate jet and add another floor to their new corporate headquarters.”

I wish I had been wrong, but last week, the FDIC was forced to rush in to take over two failing banks—Silicon Valley Bank and Signature Bank—and then take extraordinary actions to protect those banks' customers and prevent the contagion from spreading throughout the economy.

Both SVB and Signature Bank suffered from a toxic mix of poor risk management and weak supervision. If Congress and the Federal Reserve had not rolled back key provisions of Dodd-Frank, these banks would have been subject to stronger liquidity and capital requirements to help withstand financial shocks. They would have been required to conduct regular stress tests to expose their vulnerabilities and shore up their businesses. They would have had a more aggressive regulator standing at their shoulder, looking more closely at every part of the banks' business. But because those stringent requirements were taken out of Dodd-Frank, when an old-fashioned bank run hit SVB, the bank could not withstand the pressure.

Shortly after that, Signature Bank collapsed, and to fight back the risk of contagion and to protect the banking system, the Federal Government once again was called on to take extraordinary measures—the kind of measures that Dodd-Frank was originally supposed to protect us against.

These threats should never have been allowed to materialize, and now, we must prevent them from occurring

again by reversing the dangerous bank deregulation of the Trump era.

On Monday, President Biden called on Congress and regulators to reverse the Trump-era deregulation and “strengthen the rules on banks to make it less likely that this kind of bank failure will happen again.” The President is right, and that is why today, on the 5-year anniversary of having weakened Dodd-Frank, I am introducing legislation, along with 15 of my colleagues—including the Presiding Officer, including my colleague from Vermont—to reverse the mistakes that Congress and President Trump made 5 years ago when they rolled back a portion of Dodd-Frank.

This is what my legislation does:

First, it repeals section 401 of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. This will restore strong Fed oversight of some of the Nation’s largest banks, which together hold trillions of dollars in assets. Stronger oversight will help protect our economy from heightened risk. It is absolutely essential that we demand stronger, not weaker, oversight of these multibillion-dollar banks.

Second, my bill repeals section 402 of the 2018 law. That section slashed the capital requirements for large, systemically significant custody banks. Big banks cannot be trusted with lower capital requirements that degrade their ability to withstand financial shock.

Finally, my bill repeals section 403, which made it easier for giant banks—those much larger than SVB—to weaken liquidity requirements by adding municipal debt to the definition of “high-quality liquid assets,” particularly because such debt is actually not very liquid at all.

Now, there are a lot more changes we need to make to our banking laws. There are many other provisions in the 2018 law that I oppose. But today I remain focused on exactly the weakened rules that permitted banks like SVB and Signature to load up on risks, run up their profits, pay their executives giant bonuses, and eventually blow the banks to pieces.

I recognize legislation won’t fix everything. For 5 years, Jay Powell has overseen a deregulatory effort at the Federal Reserve Bank for banks like SVB. In 2021, I asked him if he could name a single—a single—regulation on banks that he thought should actually be strengthened instead of weakened, and he could not.

Preventing further crises will require a complete 180-degree turnaround from the Fed starting immediately. This bill will address the immediate issue in front of us—an explosion of risk in large financial institutions like SVB that have been inadequately supervised and regulated for the last 4 years—and it will show Americans across the country, in the wake of this disaster, that Congress is capable of acting quickly and decisively to make sure

that a serious problem doesn’t get worse—a lot worse.

The bank failures our Nation experienced this weekend were entirely avoidable if Congress and the Fed had done their jobs and kept strong oversight of big banks in place. Now, we must act quickly to prevent the next crisis by repealing the dangerous Trump-era provisions that made banks weaker.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 27.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jessica G. L. Clarke, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 27, Jessica G. L. Clarke, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tina Smith, Christopher Murphy, Mazie Hirono, Tammy Baldwin, Margaret Wood Hassan, John W. Hickenlooper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Catherine Cortez Masto, Brian Schatz, Gary C. Peters, Alex Padilla, Michael F. Bennet.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 25, S. 316.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 25, S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 25, S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

Charles E. Schumer, Tim Kaine, Robert Menendez, Amy Klobuchar, Ron Wyden, Christopher Murphy, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Mazie Hirono, Jeanne Shaheen, Christopher A. Coons, Richard J. Durbin, Cory A. Booker, Mark R. Warner, Jeff Merkley, Richard Blumenthal, Margaret Wood Hassan.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, March 14, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I have just filed a cloture motion that would finally restore to Congress the power to declare war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask for consent to speak for up to 20 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, every year, I meet with local leaders and citizens in all 95 Tennessee counties, and with each visit, I am more and more encouraged by the changes I see. Low taxes, pro-business policies, and less invasive government have encouraged growth that my Democratic colleagues are not seeing back in their States. But still many areas of Tennessee are hurting, and those that